

Appn No. 10/727,162  
Amtd. Dated February 17, 2005  
Response to Office Action of December 27, 2005

2

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that the issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102*

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 5 and 12 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Askren (US 6,350,004).

It is respectfully submitted that all of the limitations of present claim 1 are not present in Askren, and thus, as discussed below, the presently claimed invention is not anticipated by Askren and the rejection is traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Referring to claim 1 of the present application, Askren does not disclose or suggest "the printer controller being configured to order and time the supply of the dot data" or "that a relative skew between adjacent rows of printing nozzles on the at least one printhead module... is at least partially compensated for".

Askren is directed to compensating for the skew of a nozzle plate 20, not compensating for a skew of adjacent rows of printing nozzles. Present claim 1 is not directed to such a feature, Askren relates to a skew of a whole printhead module. This is not what the applicant claims in present claim 1.

More specifically, Askren discloses that the skew of nozzle plate 20 with respect to the perpendicular direction of carrier travel can be caused by misalignment of a guide rod, failure to meet manufacturing specifications of the cartridge and/or nozzle plate 20, or the difficulty in maintaining perfect alignment between the replaceable cartridge which carries nozzle plate 20 and the carrier in which the cartridge is inserted (col 4, lines 19 - 26). This is furthermore highlighted in Askren where it is stated that even slight skewing of nozzle plate 20 with respect to the perpendicular direction of carrier travel, whether caused by guiderod skew, printhead manufacturing problems or the like, can result in stitching errors. Such stitching errors can be great enough to be visually perceptible. Such stitching, or swath skew, can also manifest itself in hue shifts, degrading clarity and colour (col 4, line 66 - col 5, line 7).

Thus, it is clear that Askren is directed to correction of a skew of the complete nozzle plate 20, not nozzles 30a, 30b, etc.. Although nozzles 30a, 30b, etc., in Askren are illustrated in Fig. 3 to have a relative skew between adjacent rows of printing nozzles, the printer controller of Askren is not configured to order and time the supply of the dot data to nozzle plate 20 to compensate for the relative skew between nozzles 30a, 30b, etc.. Askren only discloses compensation based on a skew of the complete nozzle plate 20.

Moreover, Askren relies on nozzles within a fire group to be fired in a sequential, predetermined order. Because the carrier moves at a constant velocity in a direction transverse to the direction of paper travel, the nozzles within a fire group are spaced at a distance from each other in the direction of carrier travel, as shown in Fig. 3 (col 4, lines 33 - 39). Askren modifies the fire order sequence of the plurality of nozzles of a firing group to shift an ink drop placement a distance of less than one pel (see for example claim 1 of

Appln No. 10/727,162  
 Amdt. Dated February 17, 2005  
 Response to Office Action of December 27, 2005

3

Askren). In contrast, the present invention is directed to the printer controller being configured to order and time the supply of the dot data as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Although Askren may modify the fire order sequence of nozzles, Askren does not disclose or suggest altering the order and timing of the supply of the dot data to compensate for a relative skew between adjacent rows of printing nozzles.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103***

The Examiner rejects all other claims based on other cited documents. However, dependent claims 2 - 18 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore incorporate all features of present claim 1. As none of the other documents disclose or suggest "the printer controller being configured to order and time the supply of the dot data" or "such that a relative skew between adjacent rows of printing nozzles on the at least one printhead module... is at least partially compensated for" it is respectfully submitted that all dependent claims are patentable in light of the cited documents.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections. The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Very respectfully,  
 Applicant:

*Simon Walmsley*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 SIMON ROBERT WALMSLEY

Applicant:

*R. Plunkett*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 RICHARD THOMAS PLUNKETT

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
 393 Darling Street  
 Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Faxsimile: +61 2 9555 7762